

Diffusive KPP Equations with Free Boundaries in Time Almost Periodic Environments: I. Spreading and Vanishing Dichotomy

Fang Li

School of Mathematical Sciences
University of Science and Technology of China
Hefei, Anhui, 230026, P.R. China
and

Department of Mathematics and Statistics
Auburn University
Auburn University, AL 36849

Xing Liang

School of Mathematical Sciences
University of Science and Technology of China
Hefei, Anhui, 230026, P.R. China

and

Wenxian Shen
Department of Mathematics and Statistics
Auburn University
Auburn University, AL 36849

Abstract. In this series of papers, we investigate the spreading and vanishing dynamics of time almost periodic diffusive KPP equations with free boundaries. Such equations are used to characterize the spreading of a new species in time almost periodic environments with free boundaries representing the spreading fronts. In this first part, we show that a spreading-vanishing dichotomy occurs for such free boundary problems, that is, the species either successfully spreads to all the new environment and stabilizes at a time almost periodic positive solution, or it fails to establish and dies out eventually. The results of this part extend the existing results on spreading-vanishing dichotomy for time and space independent, or time periodic and space independent, or time independent and space periodic diffusive KPP equations with free boundaries. The extension is nontrivial and is ever done for the first time.

Keywords. Diffusive KPP equation, free boundary, time almost periodic environment, spreading-vanishing dichotomy, principal Lyapunov exponent, part metric, time almost periodic positive solution.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 35K20, 35K57, 35B15, 37L30, 92B05.

1 Introduction

This is the first part of a series of papers on the spreading and vanishing dynamics of diffusive equations with free boundaries of the form,

$$\begin{cases} u_t = u_{xx} + uf(t, x, u), & t > 0, 0 < x < h(t) \\ h'(t) = -\mu u_x(t, h(t)), & t > 0, \\ u_x(t, 0) = u(t, h(t)) = 0, & t > 0, \\ h(0) = h_0, u(0, x) = u_0(x), & 0 \leq x \leq h_0, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where $x = h(t; u_0, h_0)$ is the moving boundary to be determined, μ, h_0 are given positive constants, and the initial function $u_0(x)$ satisfies

$$u_0 \in C^2([0, h_0]), \quad u_0'(0) = u_0(h_0) = 0, \text{ and } u_0 > 0 \text{ in } [0, h_0). \quad (1.2)$$

We assume that $f(t, x, u)$ is a C^1 function in $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$, and $u \in \mathbb{R}$; $f(t, x, u) < 0$ for $u \gg 1$; $f_u(t, x, u) < 0$ for $u \geq 0$; and $f(t, x, u)$ is almost periodic in t uniformly with respect to $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $u \in \mathbb{R}$ (see (H1), (H2) in subsection 2.1 for detail). Here is a typical example of such functions, $f(t, x, u) = a(t, x) - b(t, x)u$, where $a(t, x)$ and $b(t, x)$ are almost periodic in t and periodic in $x \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\inf_{t \in \mathbb{R}, x \in \mathbb{R}} b(t, x) > 0$.

Observe that for any given u_0 satisfying (1.2), (1.1) has a unique (local) solution $(u(t, x; u_0, h_0), h(t; u_0, h_0))$ with $u(0, x; u_0, h_0) = u_0(x)$ and $h(0; u_0, h_0) = h_0$ (see [5]). Moreover, by comparison principle for parabolic equations, $(u(t, x; u_0, h_0), h(t; u_0, h_0))$ exists for all $t > 0$ and $u_x(t, h(t)) < 0$. Hence $h(t; u_0, h_0)$ increases as t increases.

Equation (1.1) with $f(t, x, u) = u(a - bu)$ and a and b being two positive constants was introduced by Du and Lin in [6] to understand the spreading of species. A great deal of previous mathematical investigation on the spreading of species (in one space dimension case) has been based on diffusive equations of the form

$$u_t = u_{xx} + uf(t, x, u), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (1.3)$$

where $f(t, x, u) < 0$ for $u \gg 1$ and $f_u(t, x, u) < 0$ for $u \geq 0$. Thanks to the pioneering works of Fisher ([10]) and Kolmogorov, Petrowsky, Piscunov ([12]) on the following special case of (1.3)

$$u_t = u_{xx} + u(1 - u), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (1.4)$$

(1.1), resp. (1.3), is referred to as diffusive Fisher or KPP equation.

One of the central problems for both (1.1) and (1.3) is to understand their spreading dynamics. For (1.3), this is closely related to spreading speeds and transition fronts of (1.3) and has been widely studied. When $f(t, x, u)$ is independent of t and x or is periodic in t and x , the spreading dynamics for (1.3) is quite well understood. For example, assume that $f(t, x, u)$ is periodic in t with period T and periodic in x with period p , and that $u \equiv 0$ is a linearly unstable solution of (1.3) with respect to periodic perturbations. Then it is known that (1.3)

has a unique positive periodic solution $u^*(t, x)$ ($u^*(t + T, x) = u^*(t, x + p) = u^*(t, x)$) which is asymptotically stable with respect to periodic perturbations and it has been proved that there is a positive constant c^* such that for every $c \geq c^*$, there is a periodic traveling wave solution $u(t, x)$ connecting u^* and $u \equiv 0$ with speed c (i.e. $u(t, x) = \phi(x - ct, t, x)$ for some $\phi(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$ satisfying that $\phi(\cdot, \cdot + T, \cdot) = \phi(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot + p) = \phi(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$ and $\phi(-\infty, \cdot, \cdot) = u^*(\cdot, \cdot)$ and $\phi(\infty, \cdot, \cdot) = 0$), and there is no such traveling wave solution of slower speed (see [14, 19, 22, 31]). Moreover, the minimal wave speed c^* is of the following spreading property and is hence called the spreading speed of (1.3): for any given $u_0 \in C_{\text{unif}}^b(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^+)$ with non-empty support,

$$\begin{cases} \lim_{|x| \leq c't, t \rightarrow \infty} [u(t, x; u_0) - u^*(t, x)] = 0 & \forall c' < c^* \\ \lim_{|x| \geq c''t, t \rightarrow \infty} u(t, x; u_0) = 0 & \forall c'' > c^*, \end{cases} \quad (1.5)$$

where $u(t, x; u_0)$ is the solution of (1.3) with $u(0, x; u_0) = u_0(x)$ (see [14, 31]).

The spreading property (1.5) for (1.3) in the case that $f(t, x, u)$ is periodic in t and x implies that spreading always happens for a solution of (1.3) with a positive initial function, no matter how small the positive initial function is. The following strikingly different spreading scenario has been proved for (1.1) in the case that $f(t, x, u) \equiv f(u)$ (see [4, 6]): it exhibits a spreading-vanishing dichotomy in the sense that for any given positive initial data u_0 satisfying (1.2) and h_0 , either vanishing occurs (i.e. $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} h(t; u_0, h_0) < \infty$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} u(t, x; u_0, h_0) = 0$) or spreading occurs (i.e. $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} h(t; u_0, h_0) = \infty$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} u(t, x; u_0, h_0) = u^*$ locally uniformly in $x \in \mathbb{R}^+$, where u^* is the unique positive solution of $f(u) = 0$). The above spreading-vanishing dichotomy for (1.1) with $f(t, x, u) \equiv f(u)$ has also been extended to the cases that $f(t, x, u)$ is periodic in t or that $f(t, x, u)$ is independent of t and periodic in x (see [5, 7]). The spreading-vanishing dichotomy proved for (1.1) in [4, 5, 6, 7] is well supported by some empirical evidences, for example, the introduction of several bird species from Europe to North America in the 1900s was successful only after many initial attempts (see [15, 29]).

In reality, many evolution systems in biology are subject to non-periodic time and/or space variations. It is therefore of great importance to investigate the spreading dynamics for both (1.1) and (1.3) with general time and space dependent $f(t, x, u)$. The spreading dynamics for (1.3) with non-periodic time and/or space dependence has been studied by many people recently (see [1, 2, 3, 11, 13, 20, 23, 25, 26, 27, 30, 32], etc.). However, there is little study on the spreading dynamics for (1.1) with non-periodic time and space dependence.

The objective of the current series of papers is to investigate the spreading-vanishing dynamics of (1.1) in the case that $f(t, x, u)$ is almost periodic in t , that is, to investigate whether the population will successfully establishes itself in the entire space (i.e. spreading occurs), or it fails to establish and vanishes eventually (i.e. vanishing occurs). Roughly speaking, for given (u_0, h_0) , if $h_\infty = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} h(t; u_0, h_0) = \infty$ and for any $M > 0$, $\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{0 \leq x \leq M} u(t, x; u_0, h_0) > 0$, we say *spreading* occurs. If $h_\infty < \infty$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} u(t, x; u_0, h_0) = 0$, we say *vanishing* occurs (see Definition 2.3 for detail). We say a positive number c^* is a *spreading speed* of (1.1) if for any

(u_0, h_0) such that the spreading occurs,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{h(t; u_0, h_0)}{t} = c^*$$

and

$$\liminf_{0 \leq x \leq c' t, t \rightarrow \infty} u(t, x; u_0, h_0) > 0 \quad \forall c' < c^*$$

(see Definition 2.3 for detail).

In this first part of the series of the papers, we focus on the study of spreading and vanishing dichotomy scenario for (1.1). Among others, we prove the following spreading and vanishing dichotomy:

- Assume (H1)-(H5) stated in subsection 2.1. For any given u_0 satisfying (1.2), either spreading occurs or vanishing occurs. Moreover, there is $l^* > 0$ such that for any given u_0 satisfying (1.2), vanishing occurs if and only if $h_\infty \leq l^*$ (see Theorem 2.2).

To characterize the detailed spreading and vanishing dynamics of (1.1), we also consider the following fixed boundary problem on half line,

$$\begin{cases} u_t = u_{xx} + u f(t, x, u), & x \in (0, \infty) \\ u_x(t, 0) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (1.6)$$

Observe that if $u^*(t, x)$ is a solution of (1.6) and $u_0(x) \leq u^*(0, x)$ for $x \in [0, h_0]$, then $u(t, x; u_0, h_0) \leq u^*(t, x)$ for $0 \leq x \leq h(t; u_0, h_0)$. Among others, we prove that

- Assume (H1)-(H5) stated in subsection 2.1. (1.6) has a unique time almost periodic positive solution $u^*(t, x)$ (see Theorem 2.1) and for any given u_0 satisfying (1.2), if spreading occurs in (1.1), then $u(t, x; u_0, h_0) - u^*(t, x) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ locally uniformly in $x \geq 0$ (see Theorem 2.2).

We note that the techniques for (1.1) can be modified to study the following double fronts free boundary problem:

$$\begin{cases} u_t = u_{xx} + u f(t, x, u), & t > 0, g(t) < x < h(t), \\ u(t, g(t)) = 0, g'(t) = -\mu u_x(t, g(t)), & t > 0, \\ u(t, h(t)) = 0, h'(t) = -\mu u_x(t, h(t)), & t > 0, \\ u(0, x) = u_0(x), & h_0 \leq x \leq g_0 \\ h(0) = h_0, g(0) = g_0 \end{cases} \quad (1.7)$$

where both $x = g(t)$ and $x = h(t)$ are to be determined and u_0 satisfies

$$\begin{cases} u_0 \in C^2([g_0, h_0]) \\ u_0(g_0) = u_0(h_0) = 0 \text{ and } u_0 > 0 \text{ in } (g_0, h_0). \end{cases} \quad (1.8)$$

Under the assumptions (H1), (H2), (H4)*, and (H5) (see section 6 for (H4)*), spreading-vanishing dichotomy for (1.7) also holds. In particular, we prove that

• Assume (H1), (H2), (H4)*, and (H5). For given $h_0 > 0$ and u_0 satisfying (1.8), either $h_\infty - g_\infty < \infty$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} u(t, x; u_0, h_0, g_0) = 0$ uniformly in x , or $h_\infty = -g_\infty = \infty$ and $\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{|x| \leq M} u(t, x; u_0, h_0, g_0) > 0$ for any $M > 0$ (see Proposition 6.2).

In the second part of the series of the papers, we will study the existence of spreading speeds for (1.1) and the existence of time almost periodic semi-wave solutions of the following free boundary problem associated to (1.1),

$$\begin{cases} u_t = u_{xx} + uf(t, x, u), & t > 0, -\infty < x < h(t) \\ u(t, h(t)) = 0, & t > 0, \\ h'(t) = -\mu u_x(t, h(t)), & t > 0. \end{cases} \quad (1.9)$$

If $(u(t, x), h(t))$ is an entire solution of (1.9), it is called a *semi-wave solution* of (1.9).

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the definitions and standing assumptions and state the main results of the paper. We present preliminary materials in Section 3 for the use in later sections. Section 4 is devoted to the investigation of time almost periodic KPP equation (1.6) on the half line and to the proof of Theorem 2.1. In Section 5, we explore the spreading and vanishing dichotomy scenario of (1.1) and prove Theorem 2.2. The paper is ended with some remarks on spreading-vanishing dichotomy for (1.7) in Section 6.

2 Definitions, Assumptions, and Main Results

In this section, we introduce the definitions and standing assumptions, and state the main results.

2.1 Definitions and assumptions

In this subsection, we introduce the definitions and standing assumptions. We first recall the definition of almost periodic functions, next recall the definition of principal Lyapunov exponents for some linear parabolic equations, then state the standing assumptions, and finally introduce the definition of spreading and vanishing for (1.1).

Definition 2.1 (Almost periodic function). (1) A continuous function $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called almost periodic if for any $\epsilon > 0$, the set

$$T(\epsilon) = \{\tau \in \mathbb{R} \mid |f(t + \tau) - f(t)| < \epsilon \text{ for all } t \in \mathbb{R}\}$$

is relatively dense in $\mathbb{R}$.

(2) Let $g(t, x, u)$ be a continuous function of $(t, x, u) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n$. g is said to be almost periodic in t uniformly with respect to $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and u in bounded sets if g is uniformly continuous in $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$, and u in bounded sets and for each $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $g(t, x, u)$ is almost periodic in t .

(3) For a given almost periodic function $g(t, x, u)$, the hull $H(g)$ of g is defined by

$$H(g) = \{\tilde{g}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot) \mid \exists t_n \rightarrow \infty \text{ such that } g(t + t_n, x, u) \rightarrow \tilde{g}(t, x, u) \text{ uniformly in } t \in \mathbb{R}, \\ (x, u) \text{ in bounded sets}\}.$$

Remark 2.1. (1) Let $g(t, x, u)$ be a continuous function of $(t, x, u) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n$. g is almost periodic in t uniformly with respect to $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and u in bounded sets if and only if g is uniformly continuous in $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$, and u in bounded sets and for any sequences $\{\alpha'_n\}$, $\{\beta'_n\} \subset \mathbb{R}$, there are subsequences $\{\alpha_n\} \subset \{\alpha'_n\}$, $\{\beta_n\} \subset \{\beta'_n\}$ such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} g(t + \alpha_n + \beta_m, x, u) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g(t + \alpha_n + \beta_n, x, u)$$

for each $(t, x, u) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n$ (see [9, Theorems 1.17 and 2.10]).

(2) We may write $g(\cdot + t, \cdot, \cdot)$ as $g \cdot t(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$.

For a given positive constant $l > 0$ and a given C^1 function $a(t, x)$ which is almost periodic in t uniformly in x in bounded sets, consider

$$\begin{cases} v_t = v_{xx} + a(t, x)v, & 0 < x < l \\ v_x(t, 0) = v(t, l) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

Let

$$Y(l) = \{u \in C([0, l]) \mid u(l) = 0\}$$

with the norm $\|u\| = \max_{x \in [0, l]} |u(x)|$ for $u \in Y(l)$. Let $A = \Delta$ acting on $Y(l)$ with $\mathcal{D}(A) = \{u \in C^2([0, l]) \cap Y(l) \mid u_x(0) = 0\}$. Note that A is a sectorial operator. Let $0 < \alpha < 1$ be such that $\mathcal{D}(A^\alpha) \subset C^1([0, l])$. Fix such an α . Let

$$X(l) = \mathcal{D}(A^\alpha). \quad (2.2)$$

Then $X(l)$ is strongly ordered Banach spaces with positive cone

$$X^+(l) = \{u \in X(l) \mid u(x) \geq 0\}.$$

Let

$$X^{++}(l) = \text{Int}(X^+(l)).$$

If no confusion occurs, we may write $X(l)$ as X .

By semigroup theory (see [24]), for any $v_0 \in X(l)$, (2.1) has a unique solution $v(t, \cdot; v_0, a)$ with $v(0, \cdot; v_0, a) = v_0(\cdot)$.

For a given positive constant $l > 0$ and a given C^1 function $a(t, x)$ which is almost periodic function in t uniformly in x in bounded sets, consider also

$$\begin{cases} v_t = v_{xx} + a(t, x)v, & 0 < x < l \\ v(t, 0) = v(t, l) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (2.3)$$

Let

$$\tilde{Y}(l) = \{u \in C([0, l]) \mid u(0) = u(l) = 0\}.$$

Let $A = \Delta$ acting on $\tilde{Y}(l)$ with $\mathcal{D}(A) = \{u \in C^2([0, l]) \cap \tilde{Y}(l)\}$. Note that A is a sectorial operator. Let $0 < \alpha < 1$ be such that $\mathcal{D}(A^\alpha) \subset C^1([0, l])$. Fix such an α . Let

$$\tilde{X}(l) = \mathcal{D}(A^\alpha). \quad (2.4)$$

Then, for any $v_0 \in \tilde{X}(l)$, (2.3) has a unique solution $\tilde{v}(t, \cdot; v_0, a)$ with $\tilde{v}(0, \cdot; v_0, a) = v_0(\cdot)$.

Definition 2.2 (Principal Lyapunov exponent). (1) Let $V(t, a)v_0 = v(t, \cdot; v_0, a)$ for $v_0 \in X(l)$ and

$$\lambda(a, l) = \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln \|V(t, a)\|_{X(l)}}{t}.$$

$\lambda(a, l)$ is called the principal Lyapunov exponent of (2.1).

(2) Let

$$\tilde{\lambda}(a, l) = \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln \|\tilde{V}(t, a)\|_{\tilde{X}(l)}}{t}$$

where $\tilde{V}(t, a)v_0 = \tilde{v}(t, \cdot; v_0, a)$ for $v_0 \in \tilde{X}(l)$. $\tilde{\lambda}(a, l)$ is called the principal Lyapunov exponent of (2.3).

Let (H1)-(H5) be the following standing assumptions.

(H1) $f(t, x, u)$ is C^1 in $(t, x, u) \in \mathbb{R}^3$, $Df = (f_t, f_x, f_u)$ is bounded in $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ and in u in bounded sets, and f is monostable in u in the sense that there are $M > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}, x \in \mathbb{R}, u \geq M} f(t, x, u) < 0$$

and

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}, x \in \mathbb{R}, u \geq 0} f_u(t, x, u) < 0.$$

(H2) $f(t, x, u)$ and $Df(t, x, u) = (f_t(t, x, u), f_x(t, x, u), f_u(t, x, u))$ are almost periodic in t uniformly with respect to $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and u in bounded sets.

(H3) There is $l^* > 0$ such that $\lambda(a(\cdot, \cdot), l) > 0$ for $l > l^*$, where $a(t, x) = f(t, x, 0)$.

(H4) There are $y^* \geq 0$ and $L^* \geq 0$ such that $\tilde{\lambda}(a(\cdot, \cdot + y), l) > 0$ for $y \geq y^*$ and $l \geq L^*$.

(H5) For any given sequence $\{y'_n\} \subset \mathbb{R}$ and $\{g'_n\} \subset H(f)$, there are subsequences $\{y_n\} \subset \{y'_n\}$ and $\{g_n\} \subset \{g'_n\}$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g_n(t, x + y_n, u)$ exists uniformly in $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and (x, u) in bounded sets.

Assume (H1) and (H2). We remark that, if $f(t, x, u) \equiv f(t, u)$, then (H3) (resp. (H4)) holds if and only if $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t f(s, 0) ds > 0$ (see Lemma 3.4 for the reasoning). If $f(t, x, u) \equiv f(t, u)$ or $f(t, x, u)$ is periodic in x , (H5) is automatically true.

Consider (1.1). Throughout this paper, we assume (H1) and (H2). For any given u_0 satisfying (1.2), (1.1) has a unique solution $(u(t, x; u_0, h_0), h(t; u_0, h_0))$ with $u(0, x; u_0, h_0) = u_0(x)$ and $h(0; u_0, h_0) = h_0$ (see [5]). By comparison principle for parabolic equations, $u(t, x; u_0, h_0)$ exists for all $t > 0$ and $u_x(t, x; u_0, h_0) \leq 0$ for $t > 0$. Hence $h(t; u_0, h_0)$ is monotonically increasing, and therefore there exists $h_\infty \in (0, +\infty]$ such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} h(t; u_0, h_0) = h_\infty$.

Definition 2.3 (Spreading-vanishing and spreading speed). *Consider (1.1).*

- (1) *For any given u_0 satisfying (1.2), let $h_\infty = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} h(t; u_0, h_0)$. It is said that the vanishing occurs if $h_\infty < \infty$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|u(t, \cdot; u_0, h_0)\|_{C([0, h(t)])} = 0$. It is said that the spreading occurs if $h_\infty = \infty$ and $\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} u(t, x; u_0, h_0) > 0$ locally uniformly in $x \in [0, \infty)$.*
- (2) *A real number $c^* > 0$ is called the spreading speed of (1.1) if for any (u_0, h_0) such that (1.2) is satisfied and the spreading occurs, there holds*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{h(t; u_0, h_0)}{t} = c^*$$

and

$$\liminf_{0 \leq x \leq c' t, t \rightarrow \infty} u(t, x; u_0, h_0) > 0, \quad \forall c' < c^*.$$

Biologically, spreading means that the free boundary $x = h(t; u_0, h_0)$ goes to infinity as $t \rightarrow \infty$ (i.e., $h_\infty = \infty$), and population $u(t, x; u_0, h_0)$ successfully establishes itself in the entire space. On the other hand, vanishing means that the free boundary fails to move eventually, and the population fails to establish and vanishes eventually.

2.2 Main results

In this subsection, we state the main results of this paper. The first theorem is about the existence of time almost periodic positive solution of (1.6).

Theorem 2.1 (Almost periodic solutions). *Consider (1.6) and assume (H1)-(H5). Then there is a unique time almost periodic positive solution $u^*(t, x)$ of (1.6) and for any $u_0 \in C_{\text{unif}}^b([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}^+)$ with $\inf_{x \in [0, \infty)} u_0(x) > 0$,*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|u(t, \cdot; u_0) - u^*(t, \cdot)\|_{C([0, \infty))} = 0,$$

where $u(t, x; u_0)$ is the solution of (1.6) with $u(0, x; u_0) = u_0(x)$. If, in addition, $f(t, x, u) \equiv f(t, u)$, then $u^*(t, x) \equiv V^*(t)$, where $V^*(t)$ is the unique time almost periodic positive solution of the following ODE,

$$\dot{u} = uf(t, u). \tag{2.5}$$

The following theorem is about the spreading and vanishing dichotomy of (1.1).

Theorem 2.2 (Spreading-vanishing dichotomy). *Assume (H1)-(H5). For any given $h_0 > 0$ and $u_0(\cdot)$ satisfying (1.2), the following hold.*

(1) *Either*

(i) $h_\infty \leq l^*$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} u(t, x; u_0, h_0) = 0$

or

(ii) $h_\infty = \infty$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} [u(t, x; u_0, h_0) - u^*(t, x)] = 0$ locally uniformly for $x \in [0, +\infty)$, where $u^*(t, x)$ is as in Theorem 2.1.

(2) *If $h_0 \geq l^*$, then $h_\infty = \infty$.*

(3) *Suppose $h_0 < l^*$. Then there exists $\mu^* > 0$ such that spreading occurs if $\mu > \mu^*$ and vanishing occurs if $\mu \leq \mu^*$.*

We remark that similar results as those in Theorems 2.1 and 2.2 hold for (1.7) (see Propositions 6.1 and 6.2).

3 Preliminary

In this section, we present some preliminary results to be applied in later sections, including basic properties for principal Lyapunov exponents (see subsection 3.1), non-increasing property of the so called part metric associated to diffusive KPP equations in both bounded and unbounded domains (see subsection 3.2.), the asymptotic dynamics of diffusive KPP equations with time almost periodic dependence in fixed bounded environments (see subsection 3.3), and comparison principles for free boundary problems (see subsection 3.4).

3.1 Principal Lyapunov exponents

Consider (2.1). Let $X = X(l)$, where $X(l)$ is as in (2.2). We denote by $\|\cdot\|$ either the norm in X or in $\mathcal{L}(X, X)$. Recall that for any $v_0 \in X$, (2.1) has a unique solution $v(t, \cdot; v_0, a)$ and

$$\lambda(a, l) = \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln \|V(t, a)\|_{X(l)}}{t},$$

where $V(t, a)v_0 = v(t, \cdot; v_0, a)$. For any $b \in H(a)$, consider also

$$\begin{cases} v_t = v_{xx} + b(t, x)v, & 0 < x < l \\ v_x(t, 0) = v(t, l) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

For any $v_0 \in X$, (3.1) has also a unique solution $v(t, \cdot; v_0, b)$ with $v(0, \cdot; v_0, b) = v_0(\cdot)$.

Lemma 3.1. *There is $\phi^l : H(a) \rightarrow X^{++}$ satisfying the following properties.*

(i) $\|\phi^l(b)\| = 1$ for any $b \in H(a)$ and $\phi^l : H(a) \rightarrow X^{++}$ is continuous.

(ii) $v(t, \cdot; \phi^l(b), b) = \|v(t, \cdot; \phi^l(b), b)\| \phi^l(b(\cdot + t, \cdot))$.

(iii) $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln \|v(t, \cdot; \phi^l(b), b)\|}{t} = \lambda(a, l)$ uniformly in $b \in H(a)$.

Proof. It follows from [16] (see also [18, 28]). $\square$

Lemma 3.2. $\lambda(a, l)$ is a monotone increasing function of a and l .

Proof. For any fixed a , suppose $0 < l_1 \leq l_2$. Note that $v(t, \cdot, \phi^{l_1}(a), a)$ and $v(t, \cdot, \phi^{l_2}(a), a)$ are solutions for the following problems, respectively,

$$\begin{cases} v_t = v_{xx} + a(t, x)v, & 0 < x < l_1 \\ v_x(t, 0) = v(t, l_1) = 0 \end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} v_t = v_{xx} + a(t, x)v, & 0 < x < l_2 \\ v_x(t, 0) = v(t, l_2) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Choose $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$ such that $\phi^{l_2}(a) > \epsilon \phi^{l_1}(a)$ on $[0, l_1]$. Then, by comparison principle for parabolic equations, we have that

$$v(t, x; \epsilon \phi^{l_1}(a), a) < v(t, x; \phi^{l_2}(a), a) \quad \forall 0 \leq x \leq l_1.$$

By Lemma 3.1 and a priori estimates for parabolic equations, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda(a, l_2) &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln \|v(t, \cdot, \phi^{l_2}(a), a)\|_{X(l_2)}}{t} \\ &\geq \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln \|v(t, \cdot, \epsilon \phi^{l_1}(a), a)\|_{X(l_1)}}{t} \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln \epsilon + \ln \|v(t, \cdot, \phi^{l_1}(a), a)\|_{X(l_1)}}{t} \\ &= \lambda(a, l_1) \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\lambda(a, l)$ is a monotone increasing function of l .

If we fix l , we can use comparison principle and a priori estimates for parabolic equations again to get that $\lambda(a, l)$ is a monotone increasing function of a . $\square$

In the following, if no confusion occurs, we will write $\phi^l(b)$ as $\phi(b)$.

Lemma 3.3. $\lambda(a, l)$ is continuous in a .

Proof. For any $k \geq 1$, Consider the following problem

$$\begin{cases} v_t = v_{xx} + v(a(t, x) \pm \frac{1}{k}), & 0 < x < l \\ v_x(t, 0) = v(t, l) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

Note that $e^{\pm \frac{1}{k}t} v(t, x; \phi(a), a)$ is a solution of (3.2). It follows from Lemma 3.1 that

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda(a \pm \frac{1}{k}, l) &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln \|v(t, \cdot; \phi(a), a)\|}{t} \pm \frac{1}{k} \\ &= \lambda(a, l) \pm \frac{1}{k}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $k \rightarrow \infty$, we can get that $\lambda(a \pm \frac{1}{k}, l) - \lambda(a, l) \rightarrow 0$. This together with Lemma 3.2 implies that $\lambda(a, l)$ is continuous in a . $\square$

Lemma 3.4. *Suppose that $a(t, x) \equiv a(t)$. Then*

$$\lambda(a, l) = \hat{a} + \lambda_0(l),$$

where $\hat{a} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t a(s) ds$ and $\lambda_0(l)$ is the principal eigenvalue of

$$\begin{cases} u_{xx} = \lambda u, & 0 < x < l \\ u_x(0) = u(l) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (3.3)$$

Proof. Let $\tilde{v}(t, x) = v(t, x)e^{-\int_0^t a(s) ds}$. Then (2.1) becomes

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{v}_t = \tilde{v}_{xx}, & 0 < x < l \\ \tilde{v}_x(t, 0) = \tilde{v}(t, l) = 0. \end{cases}$$

It then follows that $\lambda(a, l) = \hat{a} + \lambda(0, l)$. It is clear that $\lambda(0, l) = \lambda_0(l)$. The lemma then follows. $\square$

Remark 3.1. *Let $a(t, x)$ be a given C^1 function which is almost periodic function in t uniformly in x in bounded sets and $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$. Consider*

$$\begin{cases} v_t = v_{xx} + \gamma v_x + a(t, x)v, & 0 < x < l \\ v(t, 0) = v(t, l) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (3.4)$$

Let $\tilde{X}(l)$ be as in (2.4). Then, for any $v_0 \in \tilde{X}(l)$, (3.4) has a unique solution $v(t, \cdot; v_0, a)$ with $v(0, \cdot; v_0, a) = v_0(\cdot)$. Let

$$\tilde{\lambda}(a, \gamma, l) = \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln \|V(t, a)\|_{\tilde{X}(l)}}{t}$$

where $V(t, a)v_0 = v(t, \cdot; v_0, a)$. $\tilde{\lambda}(a, \gamma, l)$ is called the principal Lyapunov exponent of (3.4). Principal Lyapunov exponent theory for (2.1) also holds for (3.4). In particular, $\tilde{\lambda}(a, \gamma, l)$ is continuous in a and γ .

3.2 Part metric associated to diffusive KPP equations

In this subsection, we present the non-increasing property of the so called part metric associated to (1.6), and the following diffusive KPP equations with time almost periodic dependence in fixed bounded domain,

$$\begin{cases} u_t = u_{xx} + u f(t, x, u), & 0 < x < l \\ u_x(t, 0) = u(t, l) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (3.5)$$

Throughout this subsection, we assume (H1) and (H2). Let

$$H(f) = \text{cl}\{f(\cdot + \tau, \cdot, \cdot) \mid \tau \in \mathbb{R}\},$$

where the closure is taken in the open compact topology. Observe that for any $g \in H(f)$, g also satisfies (H1) and (H2).

First, consider (3.5). For given $g \in H(f)$, we also consider

$$\begin{cases} u_t = u_{xx} + ug(t, x, u), & 0 < x < l \\ u_x(t, 0) = u(t, l) = 0 \end{cases} \quad (3.6)$$

Let $X(l)$ be as in (2.2). By semigroup theory, for any $g \in H(f)$ and $u_0 \in X(l)$, (3.6) has a unique (local) solution $u(t, x; u_0, g)$ with $u(0, x; u_0, g) = u_0(x)$. Note that $u(t, x; u_0, s) := u(t - s, x; u_0, f(\cdot + s, \cdot, \cdot))$ is the solution of (3.5) with $u(s, x; u_0, s) = u_0(x)$. By (H1) and comparison principle for parabolic equations, if $u_0 \in X^+(l)$, then $u(t, \cdot; u_0, g)$ exists and $u(t, \cdot; u_0, g) \in X^+(l)$ for all $t > 0$. Moreover, if $u_0 \in X^+(l) \setminus \{0\}$, then $u(t, \cdot; u_0, g) \in X^{++}(l)$ for $t > 0$.

For any $u_1, u_2 \in X^{++}(l)$, we can define the so called part metric, $\rho(u_1, u_2)$, between u_1 and u_2 , as follows,

$$\rho(u_1, u_2) = \inf \{ \ln \alpha \mid \alpha \geq 1, \frac{1}{\alpha} u_1(\cdot) \leq u_2(\cdot) \leq \alpha u_1(\cdot) \}. \quad (3.7)$$

Note that if $u_1, u_2 \in X^{++}(l)$, then $u(t, \cdot; u_i, g) \in X^{++}(l)$ ($i = 1, 2$) for any $t > 0$ and $g \in H(f)$. Hence $\rho(u(t, \cdot; u_1, g), u(t, \cdot; u_2, g))$ is also well defined.

Next, consider (1.6) and consider also

$$\begin{cases} u_t = u_{xx} + ug(t, x, u), & 0 < x < \infty \\ u_x(t, 0) = 0 \end{cases} \quad (3.8)$$

for all $g \in H(f)$.

Let

$$\tilde{X} = \{u \in C([0, \infty)) \mid u \text{ is uniformly continuous and bounded on } [0, \infty)\} \quad (3.9)$$

with norm $\|u\| = \sup_{x \in [0, \infty)} |u(x)|$ and

$$\tilde{X}^+ = \{u \in \tilde{X} \mid u(x) \geq 0\},$$

$$\tilde{X}^{++} = \{u \in \tilde{X} \mid \inf u(x) > 0\}.$$

Note that $\tilde{X}^{++}$ is not empty and is an open subset of $\tilde{X}^+$. By semigroup theory (see [24]), for any $g \in H(f)$ and $u_0 \in \tilde{X}$, (3.8) has a unique solution $u(t, x; u_0, g)$ with $u(0, x; u_0, g) = u_0(x)$. By (H1) and comparison principle for parabolic equations, if $u_0 \in \tilde{X}^+$, then $u(t, \cdot; u_0, g)$ exists and $u(t, \cdot; u_0, g) \in \tilde{X}^+$ for all $t > 0$. Moreover, if $u_0 \in \tilde{X}^{++}$, then $u(t, \cdot; u_0, g) \in \tilde{X}^{++}$ for all $t > 0$.

For given $u_1, u_2 \in \tilde{X}^{++}$, we can also define the part metric, $\rho(u_1, u_2)$, between u_1 and u_2 as follows,

$$\rho(u_1, u_2) = \inf \{ \ln \alpha \mid \alpha \geq 1, \frac{1}{\alpha} u_1(\cdot) \leq u_2(\cdot) \leq \alpha u_1(\cdot) \}.$$

Note that if $u_1, u_2 \in \tilde{X}^{++}$, then $\rho(u(t, \cdot; u_1, g), u(t, \cdot; u_2, g))$ is well defined for $t > 0$.

We now have the following proposition about the non-increasing of part metric.

Proposition 3.1. (1) Consider (3.6) and let $u(t, \cdot; u_0, g)$ denote the solution of (3.6) with $u(0, \cdot; u_0, g) = u_0(\cdot) \in X(l)$. For given $u_0, v_0 \in X^{++}(l)$ with $u_0 \neq v_0$, $\rho(u(t, \cdot; u_0, g), u(t, \cdot; v_0, g))$ is strictly decreasing as t increases.

(2) Consider (3.8) and let $u(t, \cdot; u_0, g)$ denote the solution of (3.8) with $u(0, \cdot; u_0, g) \in \tilde{X}$.

(i) Given any $u_0, v_0 \in \tilde{X}^{++}$ and $g \in H(f)$, $\rho(u(t, \cdot; u_0, g), u(t, \cdot; v_0, g))$ decreases as t increases.

(ii) For any $\epsilon > 0$, $\sigma > 0$, $M > 0$, and $\tau > 0$ with $\epsilon < M$ and $\sigma \leq \ln \frac{M}{\epsilon}$, there is $\delta > 0$ such that for any $g \in H(f)$, $u_0, v_0 \in \tilde{X}^{++}$ with $\epsilon \leq u_0(x) \leq M$, $\epsilon \leq v_0(x) \leq M$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and $\rho(u_0, v_0) \geq \sigma$, there holds

$$\rho(u(\tau, \cdot; u_0, g), u(\tau, \cdot; v_0, g)) \leq \rho(u_0, v_0) - \delta.$$

Proof. The proposition can be proved by the similar arguments as in [13, Proposition 3.4]. For the completeness, we provide a proof in the following.

(1) For any $u_0, v_0 \in X^{++}(l)$ with $u_0 \neq v_0$, there is $\alpha^* > 1$ such that $\rho(u_0, v_0) = \ln \alpha^*$ and $\frac{1}{\alpha^*}u_0 \leq v_0 \leq \alpha^*u_0$. By comparison principle for parabolic equations,

$$u(t, \cdot; v_0, g) \leq u(t, \cdot; \alpha^*u_0, g) \quad \text{for } t > 0.$$

Let

$$v(t, x) = \alpha^*u(t, x; u_0, g).$$

We then have

$$\begin{aligned} v_t(t, x) &= v_{xx}(t, x) + v(t, x)g(t, x, u(t, x; u_0, g)) \\ &= v_{xx}(t, x) + v(t, x)g(t, x, v(t, x)) + v(t, x)g(t, x, u(t, x; u_0, g)) - v(t, x)g(t, x, v(t, x)) \\ &> v_{xx}(t, x) + v(t, x)g(t, x, v(t, x)) \quad \text{for all } t > 0, \quad 0 \leq x < l, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$v_x(t, 0) = 0, \quad v(t, l) = 0 \quad \text{for all } t > 0.$$

By strong comparison principle for parabolic equations,

$$u(t, x; \alpha^*u_0, g) < \alpha^*u(t, x; u_0, g) \quad \text{for } 0 \leq x < l.$$

Then by Hopf lemma for parabolic equations, there is $\tilde{\alpha}^* < \alpha^*$ such that

$$u(t, x; \alpha^*u_0, g) \leq \tilde{\alpha}^*u(t, x; u_0, g) \quad \text{for } 0 \leq x \leq l$$

and hence

$$u(t, \cdot; v_0, g) \leq \tilde{\alpha}^*u(t, \cdot; u_0, g)$$

for $t > 0$. Similarly, we can prove that

$$\frac{1}{\bar{\alpha}^*} u(t, \cdot; u_0, g) \leq u(t, \cdot; v_0, g)$$

for some $\bar{\alpha}^* < \alpha^*$ and $t > 0$. It then follows that

$$\rho(u(t, \cdot; u_0, g), u(t, \cdot; v_0, g)) < \rho(u_0, v_0) \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0$$

and then

$$\rho(u(t_2, \cdot; u_0, g), u(t_2, \cdot; v_0, g)) < \rho(u(t_1, \cdot; u_0, g), u(t_1, \cdot; v_0, g)) \quad \text{for all } 0 \leq t_1 < t_2.$$

(2) (i) It follows from the arguments in (1).

(ii) Let $\epsilon > 0$, $\sigma > 0$, $M > 0$, and $\tau > 0$ be given and $\epsilon < M$, $\sigma < \ln \frac{M}{\epsilon}$. First, we claim that there are $\epsilon_1 > 0$ and $M_1 > 0$ such that for any $g \in H(f)$ and $u_0 \in \tilde{X}^{++}$ with $\epsilon \leq u_0(x) \leq M$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^+$, there holds

$$\epsilon_1 \leq u(t, x; u_0, g) \leq M_1 \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, \tau], \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^+.$$

In fact, let $\tilde{M} > 0$ be such that $f(t, x, u) < 0$ for $u \geq \tilde{M}$. Then for $0 < \tilde{\epsilon} < \max\{\epsilon, \tilde{M}\}$, $u(t, \cdot; u_{\tilde{\epsilon}}, g) \leq \tilde{M}$ for all $t \geq 0$ and $g \in H(f)$, where $u_{\tilde{\epsilon}}(x) \equiv \tilde{\epsilon}$. Note that $g(t, x, u) \geq \tilde{\alpha} = \inf_{t \in \mathbb{R}, x \in \mathbb{R}^+} f(t, x, \tilde{M})$ for $u \leq \tilde{M}$. Hence by comparison principal for parabolic equations,

$$\tilde{M} \geq u(t, x; u_{\tilde{\epsilon}}, g) \geq e^{\tilde{\alpha}t} \tilde{\epsilon} \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^+.$$

The claim then follows.

Let

$$\delta_1 = \epsilon_1^2 e^\sigma (1 - e^\sigma) \sup_{g \in H(f), t \in [0, \tau], x \in \mathbb{R}^+, u \in [\epsilon_1, M_1 M / \epsilon]} g_u(t, x, u).$$

Then $\delta_1 > 0$ and there is $0 < \tau_1 \leq \tau$ such that

$$\frac{\delta_1}{2} \tau_1 < e^\sigma \epsilon_1 \tag{3.10}$$

and

$$\left| \frac{\delta_1}{2} t v g_u(t, x, w) \right| + \left| \frac{\delta_1}{2} t g(t, x, v - \frac{\delta_1}{2} t) \right| \leq \frac{\delta_1}{2} \tag{3.11}$$

for all $g \in H(f)$, $t \in [0, \tau_1]$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^+$, $v, w \in [0, M_1 M / \epsilon]$. Let

$$\delta_2 = \frac{\delta_1 \tau_1}{2 M_1}. \tag{3.12}$$

Then $\delta_2 < e^\sigma$ and $0 < \frac{\delta_2 \epsilon}{M} < 1$. Let

$$\delta = -\ln \left(1 - \frac{\delta_2 \epsilon}{M} \right). \tag{3.13}$$

Then $\delta > 0$. We prove that δ defined in (3.13) satisfies the property in the proposition.

For any $u_0, v_0 \in \tilde{X}^{++}$ with $\epsilon \leq u_0(x) \leq M$ and $\epsilon \leq v_0(x) \leq M$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and $\rho(u_0, v_0) \geq \sigma$, there is $\alpha^* > 1$ such that $\rho(u_0, v_0) = \ln \alpha^*$ and $\frac{1}{\alpha^*}u_0 \leq v_0 \leq \alpha^*u_0$.

Note that $e^\sigma \leq \alpha^* \leq \frac{M}{\epsilon}$. Let

$$v(t, x) = \alpha^* u(t, x; u_0, g)$$

$$\begin{aligned} v_t(t, x) &= v_{xx}(t, x) + v(t, x)g(t, x, u(t, x; u_0, g)) \\ &= v_{xx}(t, x) + v(t, x)g(t, x, v(t, x)) + v(t, x)g(t, x, u(t, x; u_0, g)) - v(t, x)g(t, x, v(t, x)) \\ &\geq v_{xx}(t, x) + v(t, x)g(t, x, v(t, x)) + \delta_1 \quad \forall 0 < t \leq \tau_1, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^+. \end{aligned}$$

This together with (3.10), (3.11) implies that

$$(v(t, x) - \frac{\delta_1}{2}t)_t \geq (v(t, x) - \frac{\delta_1}{2}t)_{xx} + (v(t, x) - \frac{\delta_1}{2}t)g(t, x, v(t, x) - \frac{\delta_1}{2}t)$$

for $0 < t \leq \tau_1$. Then by comparison principle for parabolic equations,

$$u(t, \cdot; \alpha^* u_0, g) \leq \alpha^* u(t, \cdot; u_0, g) - \frac{\delta_1}{2}t \quad \text{for } 0 < t \leq \tau_1.$$

By (3.12),

$$u(\tau_1, \cdot; v_0, g) \leq (\alpha^* - \delta_2)u(\tau_1, \cdot; u_0, g).$$

Similarly, it can be proved that

$$\frac{1}{\alpha^* - \delta_2} u(\tau_1, \cdot; u_0, g) \leq u(\tau_1, \cdot; v_0, g).$$

It then follows that

$$\rho(u(\tau_1, \cdot; u_0, g), u(\tau_1, \cdot; v_0, g)) \leq \ln(\alpha^* - \delta_2) = \ln \alpha^* + \ln(1 - \frac{\delta_2}{\alpha^*}) \leq \rho(u_0, v_0) - \delta.$$

and hence

$$\rho(u(\tau, \cdot; u_0, g), u(\tau, \cdot; v_0, g)) \leq \rho(u(\tau_1, \cdot; u_0, g), u(\tau_1, \cdot; v_0, g)) \leq \rho(u_0, v_0) - \delta.$$

□

3.3 Asymptotic dynamics of diffusive KPP equations with time almost periodic dependence on fixed bounded domain

In this subsection, we consider the asymptotic dynamics of (3.5). Throughout this section, we assume that f satisfies (H1) and (H2).

Let $X(l)$ be as in (2.2) and $u(t, \cdot; u_0, g)$ be the solution of (3.6) with $u(0, \cdot; u_0, g) = u_0(\cdot)$. Observe that (3.6) generates a skew-product hemodynamical system,

$$\Pi_t : X^+(l) \times H(f) \rightarrow X^+(l) \times H(f)$$

of the following form:

$$\Pi_t(u_0, g) = (u(t, \cdot, u_0, g), g_t) \quad \forall (u_0, g) \in X^+(l) \times H(f).$$

The system Π_t is strongly monotone in the sense that $u(t, \cdot, u_0, g) \ll u(t, \cdot, v_0, g)$ for any $0 \leq u_0 \leq v_0$ with $u_0 \neq v_0$ and any $t > 0$, where we write $u_0 \ll v_0$ if $v_0 - u_0 \in X^{++}(l)$.

Proposition 3.2. *Let $a(t, x) = f(t, x, 0)$.*

- (1) *If $\lambda(a, l) < 0$, then for any $u_0 \in X^+(l)$, $\|u(t, \cdot, u_0, g)\| \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ uniformly in $g \in H(f)$. In particular, $\|u(s + t, \cdot, u_0, s)\| \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ uniformly in $s \in \mathbb{R}$.*
- (2) *If $\lambda(a, l) > 0$, then there exists $u^l : H(f) \rightarrow X^{++}(l)$ such that $u^l(g)$ is continuous in $g \in H(f)$, $u(t, \cdot, u^l(g), g) = u^l(g \cdot t)(\cdot)$ for any $g \in H(f)$, and for any $u_0 \in X^+(l) \setminus \{0\}$,*

$$\|u(t, \cdot, u_0, g) - u(t, \cdot, u^l(g), g)\| \rightarrow 0$$

as $t \rightarrow \infty$ uniformly in $g \in H(f)$. In particular, $u^{*,l}(t, x) := u(t, x; u^l(f), f)$ is almost periodic in $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and for any $u_0 \in X^+(l) \setminus \{0\}$,

$$\|u(s + t, \cdot, u_0, s) - u^{*,l}(s + t, \cdot)\| \rightarrow 0$$

as $t \rightarrow \infty$ uniformly in $s \in \mathbb{R}$, where $u(s + t, \cdot, u_0, s) = u(t, \cdot, u_0, f(\cdot + s, \cdot, \cdot))$.

The proposition follows from [17, Theorem A]. For completeness, we provide a proof in the following.

Proof of Proposition 3.2. (1) Let $b(t, x) = g(t, x, 0)$ for any $g \in H(f)$. Since $\lambda(a, l) < 0$, it is well known that $\|v(t, x; \phi^l(b), b)\| \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, where $v(t, x; \phi^l(b), b)$ is the solution of (3.1) with $v(0, \cdot; \phi^l(b), b) = \phi^l(b)$ and $\phi^l(b)$ is as in Lemma 3.1. For any $u_0 \in X^+(l)$, we can choose $M > 0$ such that $u_0 \leq M\phi^l(b)$ for $x \in (0, l)$. It follows from comparison principle for parabolic equations that $0 \leq u(t, x, u_0, g) \leq Mv(t, x, \phi^l(b), b)$ for $x \in [0, l]$. This together with a priori estimates for parabolic equations implies that $\|u(t, \cdot, u_0, g)\| \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

(2) Choose $\xi > 0$ such that $\lambda(a, l) - \xi > 0$. Let $\bar{a}(t, x) = f(t, x, 0) - \xi$ and $\phi^l : H(\bar{a}) \rightarrow X^{++}(l)$ be as in Lemma 3.1. For any $g \in H(f)$, we choose $\bar{b} \in H(\bar{a})$ such that $\bar{b}(t, x) = g(t, x, 0) - \xi$. Let $v(t, x; \phi^l(\bar{b}), \bar{b})$ be the solution of

$$\begin{cases} v_t = v_{xx} + \bar{b}(t, x)v, & 0 < x < l \\ v_x(t, 0) = v(t, l) = 0 \end{cases}$$

with $v(0, x; \phi^l(\bar{b}), \bar{b}) = \phi^l(\bar{b})(x)$.

Since $\lambda(\bar{a}, l) = \lambda(a, l) - \xi > 0$, we can find $T > 0$, such that

$$\|v(T, \cdot; \phi^l(\bar{b}), \bar{b})\| \geq 1 \quad \forall \bar{b} \in H(\bar{a}).$$

Choose $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$ such that for any $g \in H(f)$,

$$ug(t, x, u) \geq (g(t, x, 0) - \xi)u \quad \text{for } 0 \leq u \leq \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|v(t, \cdot; \epsilon \phi^l(\bar{b}), \bar{b})\|.$$

Using comparison principle for parabolic equations we obtain that $v(t, \cdot; \epsilon \phi^l(\bar{b}), \bar{b}) (0 \leq t \leq T)$ is a subsolution of the problem (3.6). We then have

$$u(T, \cdot; \epsilon \phi^l(\bar{b}), g) \geq \epsilon \phi^l(\bar{b}_T)$$

and then

$$u(nT, \cdot; \epsilon \phi^l(\bar{b}), g) \geq \epsilon \phi^l(\bar{b}_{nT}).$$

Let $\omega(\epsilon \phi^l(\bar{a}), f)$ be the ω -limit set of $\Pi_t(\epsilon \phi^l(\bar{a}), f)$. We then have $\omega(\epsilon \phi^l(\bar{a}), f) \subset X^{++}(l) \times H(f)$.

We claim that for any $g \in H(f)$, there is unique $u^l(g) \in X^{++}(l)$ such that $(u^l(g), g) \in \omega(\epsilon \phi^l(\bar{a}), f)$. In fact, if there is $g \in H(f)$ such that there are $u_1, u_2 \in X^{++}(l)$ with $(u_i, g) \in \omega(\epsilon \phi^l(\bar{a}), f)$ and $u_1 \neq u_2$, then $(u(t, \cdot; u_i, g), g_t) \in \omega(\epsilon \phi^l(\bar{a}), f)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. By Proposition 3.1(1), there is $\rho_\infty > 0$ such that $\rho(u(t, \cdot; u_1, g), u(t, \cdot; u_2, g)) \rightarrow \rho_\infty$ as $t \rightarrow -\infty$. For any $t_n \rightarrow -\infty$, without loss of generality, assume that $g_{t_n} \rightarrow g^*$ and $u(t_n, \cdot; u_i, g) \rightarrow u_i^*$. Then

$$u(t, \cdot; u_i^*, g^*) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} u(t + t_n, \cdot; u_i, g)$$

and

$$\rho(u(t, \cdot; u_1^*, g^*), u(t, \cdot; u_2^*, g^*)) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho(u(t + t_n, \cdot; u_1, g), u(t + t_n, \cdot; u_2, g)) = \rho_\infty$$

for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, which contradicts to Proposition 3.1(1). Therefore, the claim holds and $u^l : H(f) \rightarrow X^{++}$ is continuous. In particular, $u^{*,l}(t, x) = u(t, x; u^l(f), f)$ is an almost periodic solution. Moreover, by the above arguments, for any $u_0 \in X^{++}$, $\omega(u_0, f) = \omega(\epsilon \phi^l(\bar{a}), f)$ and then

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|u(t, \cdot; u_0, f) - u^{*,l}(t, \cdot)\| = 0.$$

□

3.4 Comparison principal for free boundary problems

In order for later application, we need a comparison principle which can be used to estimate both $u(t, x)$ and the free boundary $x = h(t)$.

Proposition 3.3. *Suppose that $T \in (0, \infty)$, $\bar{h} \in C^1([0, T])$, $\bar{u} \in C(\bar{D}_T^*) \cap C^{1,2}(D_T^*)$ with $D_T^* = \{(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : 0 < t \leq T, 0 < x < \bar{h}(t)\}$, and*

$$\begin{cases} \bar{u}_t \geq \bar{u}_{xx} + \bar{u}f(t, x, \bar{u}), & t > 0, 0 < x < \bar{h}(t) \\ \bar{h}'(t) \geq -\mu \bar{u}_x(t, \bar{h}(t)), & t > 0, \\ \bar{u}_x(t, 0) \leq 0, u(t, \bar{h}(t)) = 0, & t > 0. \end{cases}$$

If $h_0 \leq \bar{h}(0)$ and $u_0(x) \leq \bar{u}(0, x)$ in $[0, h_0]$, then the solution (u, h) of the free boundary problem (1.1) satisfies

$$h(t) \leq \bar{h}(t) \text{ for all } t \in (0, T], \quad u(t, x) \leq \bar{u}(x, t) \text{ for } t \in (0, T] \text{ and } x \in (0, h(t)).$$

Proof. The proof of this Proposition is similar to that of Lemma 3.5 in [6] and Lemma 2.6 in [4]. $\square$

Remark 3.2. The pair $(\bar{u}, \bar{h})$ in Proposition 3.3 is called an upper solution of the free boundary problem. We can define a lower solution by reversing all the inequalities in the obvious places.

Proposition 3.4. Suppose that $T \in (0, \infty)$, $\bar{g}, \bar{h} \in C^1([0, T])$, $\bar{u} \in C(\bar{D}_T^*) \cap C^{1,2}(D_T^*)$ with $D_T^* = \{(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : 0 < t \leq T, \bar{g}(t) < x < \bar{h}(t)\}$, and

$$\begin{cases} \bar{u}_t \geq \bar{u}_{xx} + \bar{u}f(t, x, \bar{u}), & t > 0, \bar{g}(t) < x < \bar{h}(t) \\ \bar{u}(t, \bar{h}(t)) = 0, \bar{h}'(t) \geq -\mu\bar{u}_x(t, \bar{h}(t)), & t > 0 \\ \bar{u}(t, \bar{g}(t)) = 0, \bar{g}'(t) \leq -\mu\bar{u}_x(t, \bar{g}(t)), & t > 0. \end{cases}$$

If $[g_0, h_0] \subset [\bar{g}(0), \bar{h}(0)]$ and $u_0(x) \leq \bar{u}(0, x)$ in $[g_0, h_0]$, then the solution (u, g, h) of the free boundary problem (1.7) satisfies

$$g(t) \geq \bar{g}(t), h(t) \leq \bar{h}(t) \text{ for all } t \in (0, T], \quad u(t, x) \leq \bar{u}(x, t) \text{ for } t \in (0, T] \text{ and } x \in (g(t), h(t)).$$

Proof. The proof of this Proposition only requires some obvious modifications as in Proposition 3.3. $\square$

Proposition 3.5. For any given $h_0 > 0$ and $u_0 \geq 0$, $(u(t, x; u_0, h_0), h(t; u_0, h_0))$ exists for all $t \geq 0$.

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Theorem 4.3 in [4]. $\square$

Remark 3.3. From the uniqueness of the solution to (1.1) and some standard compactness argument, we can obtain that the unique solution (u, h) depends continuously on u_0 and the parameters appeared in (1.1).

4 Asymptotic Dynamics of Diffusive KPP Equations on Fixed Unbounded Domain and Proof of Theorem 2.1

In this section, we consider the asymptotic dynamics of (1.6) and prove Theorem 2.1. Throughout this section, we assume that f satisfies (H1)-(H5). We let $\tilde{X}$ be as in (3.9) and $u(t, \cdot; u_0, g)$ be the solution of (3.8) with $u(0, \cdot; u_0, g) = u_0(\cdot) \in \tilde{X}$. The main results of this section are stated in the following proposition.

Proposition 4.1. Assume (H1)-(H5). There is $u^* : H(f) \rightarrow \tilde{X}^{++}$ satisfying the following properties.

- (1) (Almost periodicity in time) $u^*(g)(x)$ is continuous in $g \in H(f)$ in open compact topology with respect to x (that is, if $g_n \rightarrow g$ in $H(f)$, then $u^*(g_n)(x) \rightarrow u^*(g)(x)$ locally uniformly in x) and $u(t, x; u^*(g), g) = u^*(g \cdot t)(x)$ (hence $u^*(g \cdot t)(x)$ is an almost periodic solution of (3.8)).

(2) (Stability) For any $u_0 \in \tilde{X}^{++}$,

$$\|u(t, \cdot; u_0, g) - u^*(g(\cdot + t, \cdot, \cdot))(\cdot)\|_{\tilde{X}} \rightarrow 0$$

as $t \rightarrow \infty$ uniformly in $g \in H(f)$.

(3) (Uniqueness) For given $g \in H(f)$, if $\tilde{u}^*(t, x)$ is an entire positive solution of (3.8), and $\inf_{t \in \mathbb{R}, x \in \mathbb{R}^+} \tilde{u}^*(t, x) > 0$, then $\tilde{u}^*(t, x) = u(t, x; u^*(g), g)$.

(4) (Spatial homogeneity) If $f(t, x, u) \equiv f(t, u)$, then $u^*(g)(x)$ is independent of x and $V^*(t; g) = u^*(g \cdot t)$ is the unique time almost periodic solution of

$$u_t = ug(t, u). \quad (4.1)$$

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Let $u^*(t, x) = u^*(f \cdot t)(x)$, where $u^*(f \cdot t)$ is as in Proposition 4.1. Theorem 2.1 then follows. $\square$

We remark that the existence and uniqueness of positive solutions which are bounded away from 0 of KPP equations in heterogeneous unbounded domains have been studied in [2] (see [2, Propositions 1.7, 1.8]). The almost periodicity and stability results in Proposition 4.1 are new.

To prove Proposition 4.1, we first prove two lemmas.

For any $L \geq L^*$ and $y \geq y^*$, consider

$$\begin{cases} u_t = u_{xx} + ug^y(t, x, u), & 0 < x < L \\ u(t, 0) = u(t, L) = 0, \end{cases} \quad (4.2)$$

where $g^y(t, x, u) = g(t, x + y, u)$ for $0 \leq x \leq L$. By (H4), $\tilde{\lambda}(g^y(\cdot, \cdot, 0), L) > 0$ for $y \geq y^*$. Then by the arguments of Proposition 3.2, (4.2) has a unique time almost periodic positive solution $u^*(t, x; g, y, L)$. Note that

$$u^*(t, x; g, y, L) = u^*(0, x; g \cdot t, y, L).$$

Lemma 4.1. Assume (H1)-(H5). Fix a $L \geq L^*$. Then

$$\inf_{y \geq y^*, L/4 \leq x \leq 3L/4, g \in H(f)} u^*(0, x; g, y, L) > 0. \quad (4.3)$$

Proof. Assume that (4.3) does not hold. Then there are $y_n \geq y^*$, $g_n \in H(f)$, and $x_n \in [L/4, 3L/4]$ such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} u^*(0, x_n; g_n, y_n, L) = 0.$$

By (H5), without loss of generality, we may assume that

$$g_n^{y_n}(t, x, u) \rightarrow g^*(t, x, u)$$

uniformly in $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and (x, u) in bounded sets.

Let $a_n(t, x) = g_n^{y_n}(t, x, 0)$ and $a^*(t, x) = g^*(t, x, 0)$. By (H2), g^* is almost periodic in t . Then

$$\tilde{\lambda}(a_n, L) \rightarrow \tilde{\lambda}(a^*, L)$$

and hence $\tilde{\lambda}(a^*, L) > 0$. Note that for any $\epsilon > 0$,

$$g_n^{y_n}(t, x, u) \geq g^*(t, x, u) - \epsilon \quad \forall n \gg 1, 0 \leq x \leq L.$$

and

$$\begin{cases} u_t = u_{xx} + u(g^*(t, x, u) - \epsilon), & 0 < x < L \\ u(t, 0) = u(t, L) = 0 \end{cases}$$

has a unique positive almost periodic solution $\tilde{u}^L(t, x)$ with $\inf_{L/4 \leq x \leq 3L/4, t \in \mathbb{R}} \tilde{u}^L(t, x) > 0$. By comparison principle for parabolic equations, we have

$$u^*(t, x; g_n, y_n, L) \geq \tilde{u}^L(t, x) \quad \forall n \gg 1.$$

This implies that

$$u^*(0, x_n; g_n, y_n, L) \not\rightarrow 0$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, which is a contradiction. Hence

$$\inf_{y \geq y^*, L/4 \leq x \leq 3L/4, g \in H(f)} u^*(0, x; g, y, L) > 0.$$

□

Lemma 4.2. Assume (H1)-(H5). Let $u_0 \equiv M (\gg 1)$. Then $u(t, \cdot; u_0, g \cdot (-t))$ decreases as t increases. Let $u^*(g)(x) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} u(t, x; u_0, g \cdot (-t))$ for $x \in [0, \infty)$. Then $u(t, \cdot; u^*(g), g) = u^*(g \cdot t)(\cdot)$ and $\inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^+, g \in H(f)} u^*(g)(x) > 0$.

Proof. First of all, by comparison principle for parabolic equations, we have $u(t, \cdot; u_0, g) \leq u_0$ for any $t > 0$ and $g \in H(f)$. Hence

$$u(t + s, \cdot; u_0, g \cdot (-t - s)) = u(t, \cdot; u(s, \cdot; u_0, g \cdot (-t - s)), g \cdot (-t)) \leq u(t, \cdot; u_0, g \cdot (-t))$$

for any $t, s \geq 0$. Therefore, $u(t, \cdot; u_0, g \cdot (-t))$ decreases as t increases. Let

$$u^*(g)(x) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} u(t, x; u_0, g \cdot (-t)) \quad \forall x \in [0, \infty).$$

Next, for any $g \in H(f)$ and $y \geq y^*$,

$$u(t, x + y; u_0, g \cdot (-t)) \geq u^*(t, x; g \cdot (-t), y, L) \quad \forall 0 < x < L.$$

It then follows that $\inf_{x > y^* + L/4, g \in H(f)} u^*(g)(x) > 0$. Choose $l > y^* + L/4$ and fix it. By Proposition 3.2,

$$u(t, x; u_0, g \cdot (-t)) \geq u^l(g)(x) \quad \text{for } 0 \leq x \leq l.$$

Note that

$$\inf_{g \in H(f), 0 \leq x \leq y^* + L/4} u^l(g)(x) > 0.$$

It then follows that

$$\inf_{x \geq 0, g \in H(f)} u^*(g)(x) > 0.$$

Now, note that

$$u(s, x; u_0, g \cdot (-s)) \rightarrow u^*(g)(x) \text{ as } s \rightarrow \infty$$

uniformly in bounded sets. This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} u(t, x; u^*(g), g) &= \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} u(t, x; u(s, \cdot; u_0, g \cdot (-s)), g) \\ &= \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} u(t + s, x; u_0, g \cdot (-s)) \\ &= \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} u(t + s, x; u_0, (g \cdot t) \cdot (-t - s)) \\ &= u^*(g \cdot t)(x) \end{aligned}$$

uniformly in bounded sets. The lemma is thus proved. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 4.1. (1) Let $u^*(g)$ be as in Lemma 4.2 for $g \in H(f)$. We prove that $g \mapsto u^*(g)$ satisfies the conclusions in (1).

First, assume that $g_n \rightarrow g^*$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. By regularity and a priori estimates for parabolic equations, there is $n_k \rightarrow \infty$ such that

$$u^*(g_{n_k})(x) \rightarrow u^{**}(x)$$

uniformly in bounded sets. We prove that $u^{**}(x) = u^*(g^*)(x)$. Suppose that $u^{**}(x) \neq u^*(g^*)(x)$. Note that $u(t, x; u^{**}, g^*)$ and $u(t, x; u^*(g^*), g^*)$ exist globally (i.e. exist for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$) and

$$\inf u(t, x; u^{**}, g^*) > 0, \quad \inf u(t, x; u^*(g^*), g^*) > 0.$$

Therefore,

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \rho(u(t, \cdot; u^{**}, g^*), u(t, \cdot; u^*(g^*), g^*)) < \infty$$

and there is $\rho^* > 0$ such that

$$\rho(u^{**}(\cdot), u^*(g)(\cdot)) = \rho^*.$$

Then by Proposition 3.1(2), for any $\tau > 0$ there is $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\rho^* \leq \rho(u(-n\tau, \cdot; u^{**}, g^*), u(-n\tau, \cdot; u^*(g^*), g^*)) - n\delta \text{ for } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Letting $n \rightarrow \infty$, we get a contradiction. Hence $u^{**}(\cdot) = u^*(g^*)(\cdot)$ and $u^*(g)(x)$ is continuous in g in open compact topology with respect to x .

Next, by Lemma 4.2, we have that, for any $g \in H(f)$, $u(t, \cdot; u^*(g), g) = u^*(g \cdot t)(\cdot)$.

We prove now that $u^*(g \cdot t)(x)$ is almost periodic in t uniformly in x in bounded sets. Note that for any given $\{\alpha'_n\} \subset \mathbb{R}$ and $\{\beta'_n\} \subset \mathbb{R}$, there are $\{\alpha_n\} \subset \{\alpha'_n\}$ and $\{\beta_n\} \subset \{\beta'_n\}$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} g(t + \alpha_n + \beta_m, x, u) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g(t + \alpha_n + \beta_n, x, u)$ for $(t, x, u) \in \mathbb{R}^3$. Assume $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} g(t + \beta_m, x, u) = g^*(t, x, u)$ and $g^{**}(t, x, u) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g(t + \alpha_n + \beta_n, x, u)$. It then follows that

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} u(t + \beta_m, x; u^*(g), g) = u^*(g^* \cdot t)(x)$$

uniformly in x in bounded sets,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} u(t + \alpha_n + \beta_m, x; u^*(g), g) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} u(\alpha_n, x; u^*(g^* \cdot t), g^* \cdot t) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} u(t, x; u^*(g^* \cdot \alpha_n), g^* \cdot \alpha_n) \\ &= u^*(g^{**} \cdot t)(x) \end{aligned}$$

uniformly in x in bounded sets, and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} u(t + \alpha_n + \beta_n, x; u^*(g), g) = u^*(g^{**} \cdot t)(x)$$

uniformly in x in bounded set. Therefore $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} u(t + \alpha_n + \beta_m, x; u^*(g), g) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} u(t + \alpha_n + \beta_n, x; u^*(g), g)$. By regularity and a priori estimates for parabolic equations, $u(t, x; u^*(g), g)$ is uniformly continuous in $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^+$. Hence, $u^*(g \cdot t)(x)$ is almost periodic in t uniformly in x in bounded set.

(2) For any $u_0 \in \tilde{X}^{++}$ and $g \in H(f)$. By Proposition 3.1(2), $\rho(u(t, \cdot; u_0, g), u^*(g \cdot t)(\cdot))$ decreases as t increases. It suffices to prove that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \rho(u(t, \cdot; u_0, g), u^*(g \cdot t)(\cdot)) = 0$. Suppose that this is not true. Then there are $t_n \rightarrow \infty$, $g^* \in H(f)$, $u^{**}, \tilde{u}^{**} \in \tilde{X}^{++}$ with $u^{**} \neq \tilde{u}^{**}$ such that $g \cdot t_n \rightarrow g^*$, $u^*(g \cdot t_n)(x) \rightarrow u^{**}(x)$ and $u(t_n, \cdot; u_0, g) \rightarrow \tilde{u}^{**}(x)$ locally uniformly in $x \geq 0$. Note that $u(t, \cdot; u^{**}, g^*)$ and $u(t, \cdot; \tilde{u}^{**}, g^*)$ exists for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \rho(u(t, \cdot; u^{**}, g^*), u(t, \cdot; \tilde{u}^{**}, g^*)) < \infty,$$

and there is $\rho^* > 0$ such that

$$\rho(u^{**}, \tilde{u}^{**}) = \rho^*.$$

By the arguments in (1) and Proposition 3.1(2), $u^{**} = \tilde{u}^{**}$, a contradiction. Therefore

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \rho(u(t, \cdot; u_0, g), u^*(g \cdot t)(\cdot)) = 0$$

and then

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|u(t, x; u_0, g) - u^*(g)(x)\|_{\tilde{X}} = 0$$

uniformly in $g \in H(f)$.

(3) Suppose that $\tilde{u}^*(t, x)$ is an entire positive solution of (3.8), and $\inf_{t \in \mathbb{R}, x \in \mathbb{R}^+} \tilde{u}^*(t, x) > 0$. Assume $\tilde{u}^*(0, x) \not\equiv u^*(g)(x)$. By the arguments in (1) and Proposition 3.1(2), there is $\delta_1 > 0$ such that

$$\rho(\tilde{u}^*(0, \cdot), u^*(g)(\cdot)) \leq \rho(\tilde{u}^*(-n, \cdot), u^*(g \cdot (-n))(\cdot)) - n\delta_1$$

for $n \geq 1$. Letting $n \rightarrow \infty$, we get a contradiction. Therefore $\tilde{u}^*(0, x) \equiv u^*(g)(x)$ and then $\tilde{u}^*(t, x) \equiv u^*(g \cdot t)(x)$.

(4) It follows from the fact that, if $f(t, x, u) \equiv f(t, u)$, then for $u_0 \equiv M$, $u(t, x; u_0, g)$ is independent of x . $\square$

5 Spreading-Vanishing Dichotomy in Diffusive KPP Equations with a Free Boundary and Proof of Theorem 2.2

In this section, we study the spreading/vanishing scenario of (1.1) and prove Theorem 2.2. Throughout this section, we assume (H1)-(H5).

We first prove a lemma. For any given $h_0 > 0$ and u_0 satisfying (1.2), recall that $(u(t, x; u_0, h_0), h(t; u_0, h_0))$ is the solution of (1.1), and $x = h(t; u_0, h_0)$ is increasing, and therefore there exists $h_\infty \in (0, +\infty]$ such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} h(t; u_0, h_0) = h_\infty$. To stress the dependence of $h(t; u_0, h_0)$ on μ , we now write $h_\mu(t; u_0, h_0)$ instead of $h(t; u_0, h_0)$ and $h_\infty(\mu)$ instead of h_∞ in the following. If no confusion occurs, we write $h_\mu(t; u_0, h_0)$ as $h_\mu(t)$.

Lemma 5.1. *For any $t \in (0, +\infty)$, $h_\mu(t)$ is a strictly increasing function of μ .*

Proof. Suppose $0 < \mu_1 < \mu_2$. Let (u_1, h_{μ_1}) and (u_2, h_{μ_2}) are the solutions of the following free boundary problems

$$\begin{cases} u_t = u_{xx} + uf(t, x, u), & t > 0, 0 < x < h_{\mu_1}(t) \\ h'_{\mu_1}(t) = -\mu_1 u_x(t, h_{\mu_1}(t)), & t > 0 \\ u_x(t, 0) = u(t, h_{\mu_1}(t)) = 0, & t > 0 \\ h_{\mu_1}(0) = h_0, u(0, x) = u_0(x), & 0 < x \leq h_0 \end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} u_t = u_{xx} + uf(t, x, u), & t > 0, 0 < x < h_{\mu_2}(t) \\ h'_{\mu_2}(t) = -\mu_2 u_x(t, h_{\mu_2}(t)), & t > 0 \\ u_x(t, 0) = u(t, h_{\mu_2}(t)) = 0, & t > 0 \\ h_{\mu_2}(0) = h_0, u(0, x) = u_0(x), & 0 < x \leq h_0. \end{cases}$$

Since $0 < \mu_1 < \mu_2$, then we have

$$h'_{\mu_1}(t) = -\mu_1 u_x(t, h_{\mu_1}(t)) < -\mu_2 u_x(t, h_{\mu_1}(t)).$$

By Proposition 3.3, we can obtain

$$h_{\mu_1}(t) \leq h_{\mu_2}(t) \text{ for } t \in [0, +\infty).$$

Now we prove $h_\mu(t)$ is strictly increasing. If not, then we can find a first $t^* > 0$ such that $h_{\mu_1}(t) < h_{\mu_2}(t)$ for $t \in (0, t^*)$ and $h_{\mu_1}(t^*) = h_{\mu_2}(t^*)$. It follows that

$$h'_{\mu_1}(t^*) \geq h'_{\mu_2}(t^*).$$

Compare u_1 and u_2 over the region

$$\Omega_{t^*} := \{(t, x) \in \mathbb{R} : 0 < t \leq t^*, 0 \leq x < h_{\mu_1}(t)\}.$$

The Strong maximum principle yields $u_1(t, x) < u_2(t, x)$ in Ω_{t^*} . Hence $w(t, x) := u_2(t, x) - u_1(t, x) > 0$ in Ω_{t^*} with $w(t^*, h_{\mu_1}(t^*)) = 0$. It follows that $w_x(t^*, h_{\mu_1}(t^*)) < 0$, from which we deduce, in view of $(u_1)_x(t^*, h_{\mu_1}(t^*)) < 0$ and $\mu_1 < \mu_2$, that

$$-\mu_1(u_1)_x(t^*, h_{\mu_1}(t^*)) < -\mu_2(u_2)_x(t^*, h_{\mu_2}(t^*)).$$

Thus $h'_{\mu_1}(t^*) < h'_{\mu_2}(t^*)$. But this is a contradiction, which proved our conclusion that $h_{\mu_1}(t) < h_{\mu_2}(t)$ for all $t > 0$. $\square$

Remark 5.1. If we consider (1.7), for any $t \in (0, +\infty)$, by Proposition 3.4 and using the same argument as Lemma 5.1 we have $g_\mu(t)$ is a strictly monotone decreasing function of μ .

We now prove Theorem 2.2.

Proof of Theorem 2.2. (1)(i) Suppose that $h_\infty < \infty$. First of all, we claim that $h'(t; u_0, h_0) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Assume that the claim is not true. Then there is $t_n \rightarrow \infty$ ($t_n \geq 1$) such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} h'(t_n; u_0, h_0) > 0$. Let $h_n(t) = h(t + t_n; u_0, h_0)$ for $t \geq -1$. Note that $h_n(t) \rightarrow h_\infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ uniformly in $t \geq -1$. By [6, Theorem 2.1], $\{h'_n(t)\}$ is uniformly bounded and equicontinuous on $[-1, \infty)$. We then may assume that there is a continuous function $h^*(t)$ such that $h'_n(t) \rightarrow h^*(t)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ uniformly in t in bounded sets of $[-1, \infty)$. It then follows that $h^*(t) = \frac{dh_\infty}{dt} \equiv 0$ and then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} h'(t_n; u_0, h_0) = 0$, which is a contradiction. Hence the claim holds.

By regularity and a priori estimates for parabolic equations, for any sequence $t_n \rightarrow \infty$, there are $t_{n_k} \rightarrow \infty$ and $u^* \in C^1(\mathbb{R} \times [0, h_\infty])$ and $g^* \in H(f)$ such that

$$f \cdot t_{n_k} \rightarrow g^*$$

and

$$\|u(t + t_{n_k}, \cdot; u_0, h_0) - u^*(t, \cdot)\|_{C^1([0, h(t+t_{n_k})])} \rightarrow 0$$

as $t_{n_k} \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, we have that $u^*(t, x)$ is an entire solution of

$$\begin{cases} u_t = u_{xx} + ug^*(t, x, u), & 0 < x < h_\infty \\ u_x(t, 0) = u(t, h_\infty) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (5.1)$$

Next, we show that $h_\infty < \infty$ implies $h_\infty \leq l^*$. Assume that $h_\infty \in (l^*, \infty)$. Then there exists $\tilde{T} > 0$ such that $h(t) > h_\infty - \epsilon > l^*$ for all $t \geq \tilde{T}$ and some small $\epsilon > 0$. Consider

$$\begin{cases} v_t = v_{xx} + vf(t, x, v), & 0 < x < h_\infty - \epsilon \\ v_x(t, 0) = v(t, h_\infty - \epsilon) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (5.2)$$

By comparison principle for parabolic equations,

$$u(t + \tilde{T}, \cdot; u_0, h_0) \geq v(t + \tilde{T}, \cdot; u(\tilde{T}, \cdot; u_0, h_0), \tilde{T}) \quad \text{for } t \geq 0,$$

where $v(t + \tilde{T}, \cdot; u(\tilde{T}, \cdot; u_0, h_0), \tilde{T})$ is the solution of (5.2) with $u(\tilde{T}, \cdot; u(\tilde{T}, \cdot; u_0, h_0), \tilde{T}) = u(\tilde{T}, \cdot; u_0, h_0)$. By Proposition 3.2, (5.2) has a unique time almost periodic positive solution $v_{h_\infty - \epsilon}(t, x)$. Moreover, for any $v_0 \geq 0$ and $v_0 \not\equiv 0$,

$$\|v(t + \tilde{T}, \cdot; v_0, \tilde{T}) - v_{h_\infty - \epsilon}(t + \tilde{T}, \cdot)\| \rightarrow 0 \quad (5.3)$$

as $t \rightarrow \infty$. By (5.3) and comparison principle for parabolic equations,

$$u^*(t, x) > 0 \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}, x \in (0, h_\infty).$$

It then follows that $u_x^*(t, h_\infty) < 0$. This implies that

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} u_x(t, h(t); u_0, h_0) < 0$$

and then

$$\liminf h'(t) = \liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} -\mu u_x(t, h(t); u_0, h_0) > 0,$$

which is a contradiction. Therefore $h_\infty \leq l^*$.

We now show that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|u(t, \cdot; u_0, h_0)\|_{C([0, h(t)])} = 0$. Let $\bar{u}(t, x)$ denote the solution of the problem

$$\begin{cases} \bar{u}_t = \bar{u}_{xx} + \bar{u}f(t, x, \bar{u}), & t > 0, 0 < x < h_\infty \\ \bar{u}_x(t, 0) = \bar{u}(t, h_\infty) = 0, & t > 0 \\ \bar{u}(0, x) = \tilde{u}_0(x), & 0 \leq x \leq h_\infty \end{cases}$$

where

$$\tilde{u}_0(x) = \begin{cases} u_0(x) & \text{for } 0 \leq x \leq h_0 \\ 0 & \text{for } x > h_0 \end{cases}$$

The comparison principle implies that

$$0 \leq u(t, x; u_0, h_0) \leq \bar{u}(t, x) \quad \text{for } t > 0 \text{ and } x \in [0, h(t)]$$

If $h_\infty < l^*$, then $\lambda(a, h_\infty) < 0$ and by Proposition 3.2, $\bar{u} \rightarrow 0$ uniformly for $x \in [0, h_\infty]$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|u(t, \cdot; u_0, h_0)\|_{C([0, h(t)])} = 0$.

If $h_\infty = l^*$, assume that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|u(t, \cdot; u_0, h_0)\|_{C([0, h(t)])} \neq 0$. Then there are $t_n \rightarrow \infty$ and $u^* \neq 0$, $g^* \in H(f)$ such that $\|u(t_n, \cdot; u_0, h_0) - u^*(\cdot)\|_{C([0, h(t_n)])} \rightarrow 0$ and $f \cdot t_n \rightarrow g^*$ as $t_n \rightarrow \infty$. We have $u(t, \cdot; u^*, g^*)$ is an entire solution of

$$\begin{cases} u_t = u_{xx} + ug^*(t, x, u), & 0 < x < l^* \\ u_x(t, 0) = u(t, l^*) = 0. \end{cases}$$

By Hopf lemma for parabolic equations, we have $u_x(t, l^*; u^*, g^*) < 0$. This implies that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} h'(t_n) = - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu u_x(t_n, h(t_n); u_0, h_0) > 0,$$

which is a contradiction again.

(1)(ii) First note that for any fixed x , $u^l(g)(x)$ is increasing in l and $u^l(g)(x) \leq u^*(g)(x)$. Then there is $\tilde{u}^*(g)(x)$ such that

$$\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} u^l(g)(x) = \tilde{u}^*(g)(x) \leq u^*(g)(x)$$

locally uniformly in x .

We claim that

$$\tilde{u}^*(g)(x) \equiv u^*(g)(x).$$

In fact, by Lemma 4.1,

$$\inf_{x \geq 0, g \in H(f)} \tilde{u}^*(g)(x) > 0.$$

Note that $u(t, x; \tilde{u}^*(g), g) = \tilde{u}^*(g \cdot t)(x)$. Then by Proposition 4.1, $u^*(g)(x) \equiv \tilde{u}^*(g)(x)$.

Note that for any $T > 0$ satisfying $h(T) > l^*$,

$$u(t + T, x; u_0, h_0) \geq u^l(t, x; u(T, \cdot; u_0, h_0), f \cdot T) \quad \forall t \geq 0,$$

where $u^l(t, x; u(T, \cdot; u_0, h_0), f \cdot T)$ is the solution of (3.6) with $g = f \cdot T$, $l = h(T; u_0, h_0)$, and $u^l(0, x; u(T, \cdot; u_0, h_0), f \cdot T) = u(T, x; u_0, h_0)$. Note also that

$$u^l(t, x; u(T, \cdot; u_0, h_0), f \cdot T) - u^l(f \cdot (t + T))(x) \rightarrow 0$$

as $t \rightarrow \infty$ uniformly in $x \in [0, l]$ and

$$u^l(f \cdot (t + T))(x) - u^*(f \cdot (t + T))(x) \rightarrow 0$$

as $l \rightarrow \infty$ locally uniformly in $x \in [0, \infty)$. It then follows that

$$u(t, x; u_0, h_0) - u^*(f \cdot t)(x) \rightarrow 0$$

as $t \rightarrow \infty$ locally uniformly in $x \in [0, \infty)$.

(2) If $h_0 \geq l^*$, then $h_\infty > h_0 \geq l^*$. (2) then follows from (1).

(3) Assume that $h_0 < l^*$. Let

$$\mu^* = \sup\{\mu \mid h_\infty(\mu) < \infty\}.$$

We claim that $\mu^* \in \{\mu \mid h_\infty(\mu) < \infty\}$ when $\{\mu \mid h_\infty(\mu) < \infty\} \neq \emptyset$. Otherwise $h_\infty(\mu^*) = \infty$. It means that we can find $T > 0$ such that $h_{\mu^*}(T) > l^*$. By the continuous dependence of h_μ on μ , there is $\epsilon > 0$ small such that $h_\mu(T) > l^*$ for all $\mu \in [\mu^* - \epsilon, \mu^* + \epsilon]$. Hence, for all such μ we have

$$h_\infty(\mu) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} h_\mu(t) > h_\mu(T) > l^*$$

Thus, $h_\infty(\mu) = \infty$. This implies that $[\mu^* - \epsilon, \mu^* + \epsilon] \cap \{\mu | h_\infty(\mu) < \infty\} = \emptyset$, and it is a contradiction to the definition of μ^* . So we proved the claim that $\mu^* \in \{\mu | h_\infty(\mu) < \infty\}$.

For $\mu > \mu^*$, we get $h_\infty(\mu) = \infty$. If not, it must have $\mu \leq \mu^*$, and it is a contradiction. Then spreading happens.

For $\mu \leq \mu^*$, by the Lemma 5.1 we can obtain

$$h_\mu(t) \leq h_{\mu^*}(t) \text{ for all } t \in (0, +\infty)$$

It follow that $h_\infty(\mu) \leq h_\infty(\mu^*) < \infty$, and vanishing happens. $\square$

6 Remarks

We have examined the dynamical behavior of the population $u(t, x)$ with spreading front $x = h(t)$ determined by (1.1), and proved that for this problem a spreading-vanishing dichotomy holds (see Theorem 2.2). In this section, we discuss how the techniques for (1.1) can be modified to study the double fronts free boundary (1.7).

First, note that the existence and uniqueness results for solutions of (1.1) with given initial datum (u_0, h_0) can be extended to (1.7) using the same arguments as in Section 5 [6], except that we need to modify the transformation in the proof of Theorem 2.1 in [6] such that both boundaries are straightened. In particular, for given $g_0 < h_0$ and u_0 satisfying (1.8), the system (1.7) has a unique global solution $(u(t, x; u_0, h_0, g_0), h(t; u_0, h_0, g_0), g(t; u_0, h_0, g_0))$ with $u(0, x; u_0, h_0, g_0) = u_0(x)$, $h(0; u_0, h_0, g_0) = h_0$, $g(0; u_0, h_0, g_0) = g_0$. Moreover, $g(t)$ decreases and $h(t)$ increases as t increases. Let $g_\infty = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} g(t; u_0, h_0, g_0)$ and $h_\infty = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} h(t; u_0, h_0, g_0)$.

We next consider the spreading-vanishing dichotomy for (1.7). To this end, We assume $(H4)^*$ instead of $(H4)$,

$(H4)^*$ *There is $L^* \geq 0$ such that $\inf_{y \in \mathbb{R}, l \geq L^*} \tilde{\lambda}(a(\cdot, \cdot + y), l) > 0$.*

Consider the following fixed boundary problem on $\mathbb{R}^1$,

$$u_t = u_{xx} + uf(t, x, u) \quad x \in (-\infty, \infty). \quad (6.1)$$

For given $u_0 \in C_{\text{unif}}^b(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^+)$, let $u(t, x; u_0)$ be the solution of (6.1) with $u(0, x; u_0) = u_0(x)$. By the similar arguments as those in Theorem 2.1, we can prove

Proposition 6.1. *Assume $(H1)$, $(H2)$, $(H4)^*$, and $(H5)$. (6.1) has a unique time almost periodic positive solution $u^*(t, x)$ and for any $u_0 \in C_{\text{unif}}^b(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^+)$ with $\inf_{x \in (-\infty, \infty)} u_0(x) > 0$, $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|u(t, \cdot; u_0) - u^*(t, \cdot)\|_{C(\mathbb{R})} = 0$.*

We now have the following spreading-vanishing dichotomy for (1.7).

Proposition 6.2. *Assume $(H1)$, $(H2)$, $(H4)^*$, and $(H5)$. For given $h_0 > 0$ and u_0 satisfying (1.8), the following hold.*

(1) *Either*

(i) $h_\infty - g_\infty \leq L^*$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} u(t, x; u_0, h_0, g_0) = 0$ uniformly in x

or

(ii) $h_\infty = -g_\infty = \infty$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} [u(t, x; u_0, h_0, g_0) - u^*(t, x)] = 0$ locally uniformly for $x \in (-\infty, \infty)$, where $u^*(t, x)$ is the unique time almost periodic positive solution of (6.1).

(2) If $h_0 - g_0 \geq L^*$, then $h_\infty = -g_\infty = \infty$.

(3) Suppose $h_0 - g_0 < L^*$. Then there exists $\mu^* > 0$ such that spreading occurs if $\mu > \mu^*$ and vanishing occurs if $\mu \leq \mu^*$.

Proof. (1) Observe that we have either $h_\infty - g_\infty < \infty$ or $h_\infty - g_\infty = \infty$.

Suppose that $h_\infty - g_\infty < \infty$. By (H4)* and the similar arguments as those in Theorem 2.2(1)(i), we must have $h_\infty - g_\infty \leq L^*$ and $u(t, x; u_0, h_0, g_0) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

Suppose that $h_\infty - g_\infty = \infty$. We first claim that $h_\infty = -g_\infty = \infty$. In fact, if the claim does not hold, without loss of generality, we may assume that $-\infty < g_\infty < h_\infty = \infty$. By the similar arguments as those in Theorem 2.2(1)(i), we have $g'(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Let $T^* > 0$ be such that $h(T^*) - g(T^*) > L^*$. Then by (H4)*,

$$\inf_{t > T^*, x \in [g(T^*), h(T^*)]} u(t, x; u_0, h_0, g_0) > 0.$$

Let $t_n \rightarrow \infty$ be such that $f(t + t_n, x, u) \rightarrow g^*(t, x, u)$ and $u(t + t_n, x; u_0, h_0, g_0) \rightarrow u^*(t, x)$. Then $u^*(t, x)$ is the solution of

$$\begin{cases} u_t = u_{xx} + u g^*(t, x, u), & g_\infty < x < \infty \\ u(t, g_\infty) = 0, \end{cases}$$

and $\inf_{t \in \mathbb{R}, x \in [g(T^*), h(T^*)]} u^*(t, x) > 0$. Then by Hopf Lemma for parabolic equations,

$$u_x^*(t, g_\infty) > 0.$$

This implies that

$$g'(t + t_n; u_0, h_0, g_0) \rightarrow -\mu u_x^*(t, g_\infty) < 0,$$

which contradicts to the fact that $g'(t; u_0, h_0, g_0) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Hence $(g_\infty, h_\infty) = (-\infty, \infty)$. By the similar arguments as those in Theorem 2.2(1)(ii), we have

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} [u(t, x; u_0, h_0, g_0) - u^*(t, x)] = 0$$

locally uniformly in x in bounded sets.

(2) and (3) follows from the similar arguments as those in Theorem 2.2 (2) and (3), respectively. $\square$

Acknowledgements

Fang Li would like to thank the China Scholarship Council for financial support during the two years of her overseas study and to express her gratitude to the Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Auburn University for its kind hospitality.

References

- [1] H. Berestycki and F. Hamel, Generalized transition waves and their properties, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **65** (2012), no. 5, 592-648.
- [2] H. Berestycki, F. Hamel, and G. Nadin, Asymptotic spreading in heterogeneous diffusive excitable media, *J. Funct. Anal.* **255** (2008), no. 9, 2146-2189.
- [3] H. Berestycki and G. Nadin, Spreading speeds for one-dimensional monostable reaction-diffusion equations, *J. Math. Phys.* **53** (2012), no. 11, 115619, 23 pp.
- [4] Y. Du and Z. Guo, Spreading-vanishing dichotomy in a diffusive logistic model with a free boundary, II., *J. Differential Equations*, **250** (2011), 4336-4366.
- [5] Y. Du, Z. Guo, and R. Peng, A diffusive logistic model with a free boundary in time-periodic environment, *J. Functional Analysis*, **265** (2013), 2089-2142.
- [6] Y. Du and Z. Lin, Spreading-vanishing dichotomy in the diffusive logistic model with a free boundary, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, **42** (2010), 377-405.
- [7] Y. Du and X. Liang, Pulsating semi-waves in periodic media and spreading speed determined by a free boundary model, *Ann. I. H. Poincaré-AN*, **32** (2013), 279-305.
- [8] Y. Du and B. Lou, Spreading and vanishing in nonlinear diffusion problems with free boundaries, *J. Eur. Math. Soc.*, in press. arXiv:1301.5373
- [9] A.M. Fink, Almost Periodic Differential Equations, Lectures Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 377, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1974.
- [10] R. Fisher, The wave of advance of advantageous genes, *Ann. of Eugenics*, **7**(1937), 355-369.
- [11] J. Huang and W. Shen, Speeds of spread and propagation of KPP models in time almost and space periodic media, *SIAM J. Appl. Dyn. Syst.* **8** (2009), no. 3, 790-821.
- [12] A. Kolmogorov, I. Petrowsky, and N. Piscunov, A study of the equation of diffusion with increase in the quantity of matter, and its application to a biological problem. *Bjul. Moskovskogo Gos. Univ.*, **1** (1937), 1-26.

- [13] L. Kong and W. Shen, Liouville type property and spreading speeds of KPP equations in periodic media with localized spatial inhomogeneity, *J. Dynam. Differential Equations* **26** (2014), no. 1, 181-215.
- [14] X. Liang and X.-Q. Zhao, Spreading speeds and traveling waves for abstract monostable evolution systems, *J. Funct. Anal.* **259** (2010), no. 4, 857-903.
- [15] J. L. Lockwood, M. F. Hoppes, M. P. Marchetti, *Invasion Ecology*, Blackwell Publishing, 2007.
- [16] J. Mierczynski and W. Shen, Exponential separation and principal Lyapunov exponent/spectrum for random/nonautonomous parabolic equations, *J. Differential Equations*, **191**, (2003), 175-205.
- [17] J. Mierczynski and W. Shen, Lyapunov exponents and asymptotic dynamics in random kolmogorov models, *J. Evolution Equations*, **4** (2006), 377-390.
- [18] J. Mierczynski and W. Shen, "Spectral Theory for Random and Nonautonomous Parabolic Equations and Applications," Chapman & Hall/CRC Monogr. Surv. Pure Appl. Math., Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, FL, 2008.
- [19] G. Nadin, Traveling fronts in space-time periodic media, *J. Math. Pures Appl.* **(9) 92** (2009), no. 3, 232-262.
- [20] G. Nadin and L. Rossi, Propagation phenomena for time heterogeneous KPP reaction-diffusion equations, *J. Math. Pures Appl.* **(9) 98** (2012), no. 6, 633-653.
- [21] J. Nolen, J.-M. Roquejoffre, L. Ryzhik, and A. Zlatoš, Existence and non-existence of Fisher-KPP transition fronts, *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **203** (2012), no. 1, 217-246.
- [22] J. Nolen and J. Xin, Existence of KPP type fronts in space-time periodic shear flows and a study of minimal speeds based on variational principle, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.* **13** (2005), no. 5, 1217-1234.
- [23] J. Nolen and J. Xin, A variational principle based study of KPP minimal front speeds in random shears, *Nonlinearity* **18** (2005), no. 4, 1655-1675.
- [24] A. Pazy, *Semigroups of linear operators and application to partial differential equations*, Springer-Verlag, New York, (1983).
- [25] W. Shen, Variational principle for spreading speeds and generalized propagating speeds in time almost periodic and space periodic KPP models, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **362** (2010), no. 10, 5125-5168.
- [26] W. Shen, Existence, uniqueness, and stability of generalized traveling waves in time dependent monostable equations, *J. Dynam. Differential Equations* **23** (2011), no. 1, 1-44.

- [27] W. Shen, Existence of generalized traveling waves in time recurrent and space periodic monostable equations, *J. Appl. Anal. Comput.* **1** (2011), no. 1, 69-93.
- [28] W. Shen, and Y. Yi, Almost automorphic and almost periodic dynamics in skew-product semiflow, *Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society*, **647**, (1998).
- [29] N. Shigesada and K. Kawasaki, "Biological Invasions: Theory and Practice," Oxford Series in Ecology and Evolution, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1997.
- [30] T. Tao, B. Zhu, and A. Zlatoš, Transition fronts for inhomogeneous monostable reaction-diffusion equations via linearization at zero, *Nonlinearity* **27** (2014), no. 9, 2409-2416.
- [31] H. Weinberger, On spreading speed and travelling waves for growth and migration models in a periodic habitat, *J. Math. Biol.* **45** (2002), 511-548.
- [32] A. Zlatoš, Transition fronts in inhomogeneous Fisher-KPP reaction-diffusion equations, *J. Math. Pures Appl.* (9) **98** (2012), no. 1, 89-102.